

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

*Please replace the three sheets of drawings with the attached replacement sheets.*

Sheet 1/3 of the drawings includes FIGS. 1-4 and 8. Applicant has changed FIG. 8, which is supported by the disclosure at paragraph [0017] of the original specification which states, in part, “The card 200 and socket 120 may be provided with matching non-symmetrical shapes, grooves, ridges or the like for requiring the card 200 to be inserted into the socket in the correct orientation, such as the cutoff corner of card 200 shown in Fig. 1 (lower left) and Fig. 2 (lower right).” Thus, no new matter has been added by these amendments to the drawings.

Replacement sheets 1-3 of drawings are included, although no changes were made to sheets 2/3 and 3/3.

**Remarks**

Upon entry of the present Amendment, claims 79-80, 82-98, 100-109, 111-114, 116-118, 120-122, 127, 131, 134, 136-137, 149, 156, 159-164, 167-169 and 171-182 will be pending, with claims 79, 100, 120, 149, 156, 159, 171, 174 and 176-180 being independent. Claims 81, 119, 138, 144, 165, and 166 have been canceled in this Amendment. Claims 79, 80, 82-83, 85, 89, 90, 92-98, 100-102, 104, 105, 111-113, 116-118, 120, 122, 127, 134, 136, 137, 149, 156, 159-162, 169, 171, and 174 have been amended herein to more clearly define the present invention and for editorial purposes, as further discussed below.

New claims 176-182 are presented. Support for these new claims is found in the original specification and drawings as further discussed below. No new matter has been added.

**I. Statement of Substance of Interview of December 15, 2009**

Applicant's representatives appreciate the Examiner's courtesy and professional conduct during the personal Interview of December 16, 2009.

During the Interview, the Examiner and Applicant's representatives discussed representative claim 79 in view of the Tran reference. The Examiner agreed that Tran does not disclose telephone functionality. Further, the Examiner suggested (1) changing the preamble from "a mobile entertainment and communications apparatus" to "a cellphone," or (2) changing the term "cellphone" to "cellphone functionality" in the body of the claim with the current preamble, while not limiting the cellphone to being in the housing.

**II. Statement of Substance of Interview of January 14, 2010**

Applicant's representatives appreciate the Examiner's courtesy and professional conduct during the personal Interview of January 14, 2010.

During the personal Interview, the Examiner and Applicant's representatives discussed Applicant's proposed amendments to the claims in response to the Interview of December 15, 2009, and the Examiner further proposed amending the claims as follows:

Regarding claim 79, the Examiner suggested adding the limitation "data captured by the microphone and the camera," and incorporating the limitation recited in claim 81 into claim 79.

Regarding claim 100, the Examiner suggested changing the term "images" to "data captured by the microphone and the camera," and incorporating the limitation recited in claim 119 into claim 100.

Regarding claim 120, the Examiner agreed that claim 120 as proposed by Applicant in response to the Interview of December 15, 2009 is allowable.

Regarding claim 149, the Examiner suggested adding the limitation "data to the memory, the data comprising," and the limitation "a sensor configured to activate the microphone or the camera" as recited in claim 120.

Regarding claim 156, the Examiner suggested changing the limitation "at least one of, real time sounds, still images, moving images, music, music with images, combined sounds and moving images, combined sounds with images and text, and GPS information" to "sounds and images."

Regarding claim 159, the Examiner suggested adding the limitation "to activate the device to capture data."

Regarding claims 171 and 174, the Examiner suggested adding similar limitations to the ones recited in claim 120 to these claims.

### **III. Statement of Substance of Interview of February 8, 2010**

Applicant's representatives appreciate the Examiner's courtesy and professional conduct during the telephone Interview of February 8, 2010.

During the telephone interview, the Examiner indicated that proposed claims 79, 156, 176 and 179 are allowable. The Examiner further suggested amending proposed claims 100, 120, 149, 159, 171, 174, 177, 178 and 180 to require "a microphone" for example.

### **III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 79-98, 100-109, 111-114, 116-122, 127, 131, 134, 136, 137, 149, 156, 159-169 and 171-175 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,202,060 to Tran (hereinafter as "Tran"), in view of US Patent No. 5,555,286 to Tendler (hereinafter as "Tendler") [or] US Patent No. 5,495,288 to Broady (hereinafter as "Broady"), and further in view of US Patent No. 5,957,718 to Cheng (hereinafter as "Cheng"). Applicant traverses this rejection, particularly as to the amended claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions made above during the Interviews, and for the reasons discussed below.

Applicant respectfully submits that all the claims as amended are patentable over the cited prior art as discussed above in the Statements of Interviews. New claims 176-180 correspond to claims 79, 100, 120, 156, and 159, respectively, with a preamble of "a cellphone/satellite phone." Thus, it is submitted that new claims 176-180 are patentable over the cited art for, at a minimum, the same reasons as independent claims 79, 100, 120, 156, and 159, respectively, as well as on their own merits. New claims 181 and 182 are also patentable over the cited art because they depend from patentable claims 156 and 174, respectively.


Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the Office Action, and

allowance of the present application and all the claims herein, are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this matter, the undersigned may be contacted at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ki-II KIM



Abraham Hershkovitz  
Reg. No. 45,294

Jae Youn Kim  
L0485

February 17, 2010

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
2845 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

(703) 370-4800  
(703) 370-4809 (FAX)